



## Bayesian predictive risk modeling of microbial criteria for *Campylobacter* in broilers

Nauta, Maarten; Ranta, J.; Mikkilä, A.; Tuominen, P.

*Publication date:*  
2013

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

*Citation (APA):*

Nauta, M., Ranta, J., Mikkilä, A., & Tuominen, P. (2013). *Bayesian predictive risk modeling of microbial criteria for Campylobacter in broilers*. Poster session presented at 29th European Meeting of Statisticians, Budapest, Hungary.

---

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# Bayesian Predictive Risk modeling of Microbial Criteria for *Campylobacter* in broilers

Ranta J<sup>1</sup>, Mikkilä A<sup>1</sup>, Tuominen P<sup>1</sup>, Nauta M<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Finnish Food Safety Authority Evira, Risk Assessment Research Unit, Mustialankatu 3, 00790 Helsinki, Finland

<sup>2</sup>Technical University of Denmark, Søborg, Denmark

## Abstract

Microbial Criteria define the acceptability of food products, based on the presence or detected number of microorganisms in samples. The criteria are applied at the level of defined food lots. Generally, these are interpreted as statistical batches representing the production [1]. The batches not complying with a criterion can then be e.g. rejected. A risk reduction for consumers is therefore expected. However, a quantitative estimate of the implied risk reduction is non-trivial, because it depends on many unknown parameters. The quantity and quality of data lead to uncertainties which can be assessed by computing posterior distribution of the parameters - a Bayesian evidence synthesis. The outcome of a defined Microbial Criterion (MC) for a batch provides additional evidence concerning the batch. Posterior predictive consumer risk (probability of illness) was computed for such batch(es) with the given outcome (MC met / MC not met / MC not applied) with OpenBUGS.

## Complementing evidence from two sources

Lindblad et al. [2] describe samples from a representative collection of  $N$  batches, but only one measurement (carcass) is obtained per batch. The resulting  $K$  positive outcomes provide concentrations  $y_k$ ,  $k=1, \dots, K$ . Since batch status was not known beforehand, there is some evidence on batch prevalence  $q$  and total variance, but not on within batch prevalences  $p$ .

Hansson et al. [3] describe a collection of batches known to be positive, and batch specific samples of size  $N_j$ . Due to this selection, there is no evidence on batch prevalence, but some evidence on within batch prevalences. Sample means and sample standard deviations of positive concentrations  $y_{ij}$  were given, which provides evidence on variance components  $\sigma_w^2$  (within batch) and  $\sigma_b^2$  (between batch).

The concentration model is defined for  $\log_{10}$ -concentrations that were transformed from original data to obtain comparable log-cfu/g values, with  $\mu$  as the common population mean of positive log-concentrations.

## Posterior density, assuming individual measurements $y_k$ , $y_{ij}$ :

$p(\mu, \sigma_w^2, \sigma_b^2, \{\mu_k\}, \{\mu_j\}, q, \alpha, \{p_j\} | \text{Lindblad et al. \& Hansson et al. data}) \propto$

$$\prod_{k=1}^K N(y_k | \mu_k, \sigma_w^2) N(\mu_k | \mu, \sigma_b^2) \prod_{j=1}^J \prod_{i=1}^{x_j} N(y_{ij} | \mu_j, \sigma_w^2) N(\mu_j | \mu, \sigma_b^2) \\ \times \text{Bin}(K | N, q\alpha / (\alpha + 2)) \prod_{j=1}^J \text{Bin}(x_j | N_j, p_j) \text{Beta}(p_j | \alpha, 2) \times p(\mu, \sigma_w^2, \sigma_b^2, q, \alpha)$$

In Hansson et al., only means and SDs were reported for  $x_j$  positive concentrations. For that, we solved full conditional density for  $\tau_w = 1/\sigma_w^2$  to be coded in BUGS, requiring only summary statistics. For the remaining parts the likelihood was directly coded as such in BUGS.




Figure 1: Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) for the evidence synthesis.

## Evidence synthesis combined with batch predictions under MC




Figure 2: DAG of the Bayesian model combining both data sets for common parameters, and for predicting batch parameters to be further updated by the (binary) MC status of the batch. Risk is the probability of illness resulting from accepted batches.

From the posterior distribution of common parameters, batch parameters (batch mean  $\mu_j$ , hidden contamination (binary) status  $I_j$ , within batch prevalence  $p_j$ ) were predicted as a posterior predictive distribution. After adding batch specific additional evidence on the MC outcome ('MC is met'), posterior distribution of batch parameters was updated and predicted risk concerning such batch was computed. The absolute risk value also depends on other additional assumptions [4] (Fig. 2). Relative risks were compared (Table 1).

Table 1:  $RR = P_{\text{batch}}(\text{ill} | \text{MC met}) / P_{\text{batch}}(\text{ill} | \text{MC not applied})$  for batches under different MC options 'n/c/m' = 'sample size / max positives / max cfu/g'.  $10^5$  MCMC iterations.

RR	m=1000 n=5	m=1000 n=10	m=100 n=5	m=100 n=10
c=0	0.2	0.1	0.01	0.00
c=1	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.01
c=2	0.6	0.3	0.1	0.03
c=3	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.05
c=4	0.9	0.6	0.5	0.08

## Acknowledgements

Participants of NMDD project 'Establishment of Risk based microbiological criteria in the Nordic countries: A case study on *Campylobacter* in broiler meat', (2011-2012), are acknowledged for providing data and for helpful discussions.

## References

- [1] N Commeau et al.: Hierarchical Bayesian Models to Assess Between- and Within-Batch Variability of Pathogen Contamination in Food. Risk Analysis. 2012, 32, 3, 395-415.
- [2] M Lindblad et al.: Microbiological baseline study of broiler chickens at Swedish slaughterhouses. J Food Prot. 2006, 69, (12), 2875-82.
- [3] I Hansson et al.: Within-flock variations of *Campylobacter* loads in caeca and on carcasses from broilers. Int. J. Food Microbiology. 141, (2010), 51-55.
- [4] M J Nauta et al.: Risk based microbial criteria for *Campylobacter* in broiler meat in the European Union. Int. J. Food Microbiology. 158, (2012), 209-217.